IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

1

2

MICHAEL A. ARNOLD, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

NO. C12-6426 TEH

ORDER DENYING <u>DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR</u> ORDER SHORTENING TIME

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

23

22

24

25

26

27

Dated: 03/06/13

28

stay proceedings pending possible transfer by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation and pending possible relation of this case by Judge Edward M. Chen to *Caouette v*. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., Case No. 12-1814 EMC, and other cases pending before him. Defendant also filed a motion for an order shortening time on the motion to stay but failed to request any specific timeline. Plaintiffs filed neither an opposition nor a statement of nonopposition to the request to shorten time.

On February 28, 2013, Defendant Bristol-Myers Squibb Company filed a motion to

Upon careful consideration, the Court does not find good cause to shorten time on Defendant's motion to stay. Accordingly, Defendant's motion to do so is DENIED. However, the Court will not rule on Plaintiffs' pending motion to remand until after it has first considered the motion to stay.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

the flancers

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT